

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/921,298	KUTTER, PHILIPP W.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Eric B. Kiss	2192	

**All Participants:**

(1) Eric B. Kiss

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Brian G. Brannon (Reg. No. 57,219)

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** 31 July 2007

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

Telephonic  
 Video Conference  
 Personal (Copy given to:  Applicant  Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:**  Yes  No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

1-27

Prior art documents discussed:

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

See Continuation Sheet

**Part III.**

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner proposed an amendment to overcome potential rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112 and 103(a) and place the application in clear condition for allowance. Regarding claim 1, the examiner proposed amendments to clarify antecedent basis for "the XML document" and to more clearly define the relationship between the XML document and the DTD. Regarding claims 7-11, the examiner indicated that inclusion of the term "XML-robot", which was not clearly defined in the specification such that a precise definition could be properly read into the claims, rendered these claims indefinite. The examiner proposed cancellation of claims 7-11. Regarding claims 12 and 13, the examiner proposed an amendment to more clearly define the relationship between the elements of the claims. Regarding claim 14, the examiner proposed amendments similar to those proposed for claim 1. Regarding claims 15-18, the examiner suggested that these claims were too broad under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) in view of existing prior art describing other forms of executable XML and existing compilers/interpreters. The examiner proposed cancelling claims 15-18. Regarding claims 19 and 20, the examiner noted that the specific names given to the variables carried little patentable weight and that the described processes did not appear to clearly and completely achieve the result set forth in the preamble. The examiner proposed cancelling claims 19 and 20. Regarding claims 21, 22, 23, and 26, the examiner noted that these claims (if appropriately amended) would appear to be substantial duplicates of other allowable claims (1, 2, and 5). The examiner proposed cancellation of claims 21, 22, 23, and 27, and amendments to claims 24, 25, and 27 to change the dependencies to claims 1 and 2. Mr. Brannon authorized an Examiner's Amendment incorporating all of the proposed changes to place the application in condition for allowance.